

**TAB**

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE~~

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS BY MAGS

Views of Three or More MAGs

Personnel management lacks professionalism in the Agency, e.g., standards, guidelines and criteria.

There is a need to establish panels or career services along job or functional lines.

There should be a system that will generate assignments across organizational (including Directorate) lines.

Better planning of employee mobility is needed, including rotational assignments, transfers, familiarization experiences, etc.

The vacancy notice system is not working very well.

Increased employee access to training and educational opportunities (internal and external) should be provided.

With respect to communications, employees need to know better how the personnel management system works. Information on career services, panels, criteria for promotion and evaluation, etc. should be published.

A system for evaluating supervisors on their rating ability should be established.

There is a need for planning and acting upon individual development, within and above component level.

Selected Views by One or Two MAGs

The home base concept is a barrier to a Directorate and Agency approach to personnel management.

There is a need for a more orderly system to identify and take action on marginal employees.

There is a need for the Deputy Directors to accept a more active role in personnel management.

There is a need for a Supergrade Career Service.

CIARDS has become a threat to employees, with pressures toward forced early retirement.

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

MAG Comment or Suggestion	MAGs Raising Item					PASG Comment or Suggestion
	DDO	DDI	S&T	M&S	CIA	
<u>MANAGEMENT CONCERNS</u>  Personnel management lacks professionalism, e.g., standards, guidelines and criteria.	x	x	x			Recommending Deputy Directors set Agency standards, objectives, and criteria.
Need for the Deputy Directors to accept a more active role in personnel management.	x					Recommending this role be placed with the Deputy Directors.
Home base concept is a barrier to Directorate or Agency approach to personnel management.	x				x	Recommending each Deputy Director operate a system to identify employees who rank high, low and in between
Need system for more orderly identification and separation of marginal employees.	x			x	x	Recommending Deputy Directors plan personnel management, along with operations and fiscal plans.
Need better ways to use people and money as resources are curtailed.	x		x	x		Recommending Deputy Directors provide evaluation and promotion criteria.
Need for published criteria for promotions, ranking evaluations, etc.		x	x			
The role of the Director of Personnel apparently does not involve him in personnel management.			x			
Eliminate probationary period followed by career status.				x		Recommending more vigorous efforts to early detect and terminate poor performers.
Expand number of upper slots for those who possess vital non-supervisory skills.				x		
Abolish group hiring as in CTP and hire against openings.				x		
Need to re-establish Clandestine Service concept to provide esprit de corps.	x					

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

MAG Comment or Suggestion	MAGs Rating Item					PASG Comment or Suggestion
	DRC	DDI	DEP	PER	CIA	
<b><u>CAREER SERVICE ORGANIZATION</u></b>						
Management of all clericals in an Agency-wide career service.	x					Considering Directorate-wide Clerical Career Services.
Current Career Services lack uniformity in structure.		x	x			Recommending Directorate Career Services and Agency Guidance.
Current Career Services lack uniform practices.		x			x	Ditto
Need to establish panels or Career Services along functional lines.	x		x		x	Recommending option to be exercised by Deputy Directors.
Need for a Supergrade Career Service.					x	Recommending Supergrade mechanism to consider SG vacancies and assignment plans prepared by Deputies.
Establish one Career Service for each Directorate.					x	Recommending Directorate-level Career Services.
<b><u>EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT</u></b>						
Need for plans and organization for individual development within and above component level.	x	x	x			PDP a partial answer. Recommending Deputy Directors develop further plans and organization.
Need an awareness that individual is also responsible and should make his interests known				x		This is recognized in Career Service concept.
Development now concentrates on managerial level; needed at GS-03 to GS-10 range.				x		
Current emphasis on "comers" only; not broad enough.				x		
<b><u>MOBILITY</u></b>						
Lack of opportunity to compete for senior Agency jobs.	x					Recommending inter-Directorate rotation and assignment review program.
Need a system to generate assignments across organizational (including Directorate) lines.	x	x	x		x	Proposing that Deputy Directors have this option.
Need to better protect employees when surplus or selection-out exercises take place.	x					Point recognized in PASG report.

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

MAG Comment or Suggestion	MACs Revising Item					PASG Comment or Suggestion
	DDC	DDI	SMT	MAG	CTA	
Need for better planning on mobility, rotational assignment, familiarization details, etc.	x	x	x		x	Options left to Deputy Directors.
Vacancy Notice systems (or skills bank) needs improvement.	x	x	x	x	x	Options left to Deputy Directors.
<u>COMMUNICATIONS</u>						
Employees need to know how the personnel system works. There should be published information on career services, etc., criteria, etc.	x	x	x			Recommending that each Deputy Director develop and publish standards.
Require Directors and Office Heads meet periodically with groups of employees at all levels to describe personnel management, etc.				x		(Already required, per DCI instructions.)
<u>TRAINING</u>						
Need to increase employee access to training and educational opportunities (internal and external).	x	x		x		Recommend training criteria be developed by each Deputy Director.
Need to have a system to insure that employees will be able to update their professional skills.			x	x		Criteria to be developed by Deputy Directors. PASG considering idea in modified MOS system.
Expand sabbatical program to place some employees in academic and professional jobs outside the Agency.				x		
Need to overcome syndrome that going off to training removes employee from assignment and other considerations.			x			
<u>SUPERVISION</u>						
Need a better selection system for assigning supervisors and a program of training.	x			x		Recommending each Deputy Director develop training criteria in his Career Service.

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

MAG Comment or Suggestion	MAG Raising Item					PASG Comment or Suggestion
	DDO	DDT	SAC	Rep CIA		
<u>RETIREMENT</u> CTARDS has become a threat implying employees will be forced to early retirement.	x					
<u>FITNESS REPORTS</u> Need to emphasize developmental and supervision counseling purposes of the Fitness Report.	x					
Need to evaluate supervisors on their rating ability to reduce the numbers of inflated reports, etc.	x	x	x			(No action taken by PASG; FR's previously the subject of AMC actions.)
Need to include a place for employee comments in the Fitness Reports.	x					
Suggest renaming of the Fitness Report, e.g., Progress Report or Performance Report.		x				
Ratings are deceiving if used for competitive rankings.		x				
Require periodic "Reverse" Fitness Reports on supervisors.			x			

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**TAB**

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

CAREER SERVICE RESPONSES TO PASG CAREER SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE \*  
[Relating to Their Method of Operations]

1. Have you formalized the personnel management objectives of your Career Service? If so, what are these objectives?

Response: Nearly 60% of the Career Services have no formally declared personnel management objectives.

2. Do you render an Annual Report, as Head of your Career Service, to your Deputy Director?

Response: No Career Service Head submits an overall annual report to his Deputy Director. (Several Career Services contended that APP and PDP meet this purpose. The question, however, did not intend to surface reference to these programs.)

3. Briefly describe the organizational structure of your Career Service. Do you, for example, have panels which take cognizance over people on a grade basis, a functional basis, etc.?

Responses: All Career Services have boards and panels. Most boards and panels relate to employee grade level; others mix employee grade and function; occasionally sub-panels are formed to consider functional groups within a grade. With the exception of the Medical Career Service, no Career Service has established panels with cognizance over employees by occupational categories without regard to grade.

4. What is the criteria for membership on your Career Service Board and Panels and how often is membership rotated?

Response: The large majority of the Career Services use position and rank as the criteria for membership to boards or panels. Rotation of membership is generally more active at the lower grade levels.

5. Do you have published and disseminated criteria for employee training? Please submit a copy of some.

Response: Slightly more than half of the Career Services claimed to have published training criteria. Several have worked out kinds of training applicable to different grade levels. A lesser number submitted copies of what they determined to be criteria for employee training. Very few Career Services actually disseminated this information to their employees.

6. Does your Career Service sponsor full-time (120 days or more in duration) external academic training? If so, please state number of cases and percentage against total Career Service strength in each of the last three fiscal years.

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

Response: All Career Services acknowledged a policy supporting sponsored full-time training for their employees. Although a few did not sponsor such training during the last few years, the large majority cited cases.

7. Does your Career Service circulate Questionnaires to its members on any periodic basis asking them to record their desires on assignments, training, etc.? Please submit a copy. If not, please describe how employees make known their desires about career development, etc.?

Response: The Career Services split down the middle on this question. Several cited the FRQ as evidence of their use of a questionnaire without addressing the question of the non-field assigned employee. Of those Career Services not using a questionnaire, line channels were frequently identified as the means of relaying this information from the employee.

8. Does your Career Service actively seek opportunities to place its members on rotational assignments in (a) other components of your Directorate; (b) other directorates? If so, please give examples.

Response: Three-quarters of all Career Services claimed to be actively seeking opportunities to place members elsewhere. There were indications that Career Services had trouble with the word actively in the question.

9. Does your Career Service, in addition to consultations conducted in conjunction with regular Fitness Reports, have regularly scheduled counseling sessions between a Career Service representative and its members? If so, please describe the system.

Response: Approximately three-fourths of the Career Services do not claim to have regularly scheduled counseling sessions with employees. The term regular was clearly a problem in this question, and few Career Services apparently felt they could respond in the affirmative. Nearly all Career Services acknowledged having employee counseling opportunities of some sort beyond that experienced in command channels but few had a regularized system per se.

10. Does your Career Service have published and disseminated promotion and separation standards and criteria? If so, please submit copies.

Response: This question proved rather difficult to answer. Only a couple of Career Services mentioned separation criteria and only in general terms. Some Career Services had problems with the words criteria and standards; some acknowledged having criteria published but not standards; other Career Services limited their remarks to promotion criteria. Making a liberal interpretation to measure responses, about a third of the Career Services published their promotion criteria, but dissemination was generally limited to Career Board members. Most often promotion criteria were made available to individual employees via a career management

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

officer. The fact remains that few Career Services mentioned how specific criteria were weighted or applied in promotion deliberations, e.g., employee job performance, judgement, initiative and length of service.

11. What criteria and procedures have you established for external and internal rotational assignments (outside of your Career Service)?

Response: Nearly two-thirds of the Career Services acknowledged having no special criteria for rotational assignments. The others for the most part serviced large field complements which routinely involved rotation of personnel.

12. Do you have established grievance procedures within your Career Service? If so, please describe.

Response: The Deputy Director for the DDS&T spelled out a grievance procedure in March 1973, applicable to the Directorate at large. The procedure as described is fairly simple and compatible to the informal procedures described by other Career Services which emphasize command channels as the main avenue for processing grievances. The DD/O is also giving special attention to this problem. Many Career Services did not admit to having formalized grievance procedures.

\* The DDS&T states "Each office, was asked to reply to the questionnaire, where appropriate, as though it was a separate Career Service within the DDS&T."

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**TAB**

## IDENTIFYING OCCUPATIONAL AFFINITY GROUPS IN THE AGENCY

1. Any consideration of establishing a new system (even a modest version) to identify groups of employees with common occupational or functional specialties along the lines of a modified MOS system must include the recognition that such a system must be fully computerized to be practicable and responsive to management use of such a system. OJCS resources are currently stretched beyond their capacity to be fully responsive to many of the basic requirements of the Agency today. It is worthwhile, therefore, to review the existing systems that relate to the identification of employee and position occupational groupings and specialties.

2. The Agency has two separate systems developed and operated jointly by the Office of Personnel and OJCS which are designed to identify among other information, occupational specialties as regards Agency positions and employees. These systems are the Occupational Coding System (positions and employees) and the Qualifications Record System (employees and applicants) which are implemented within the Plans and Control element of the Office of Personnel.

3. Brief descriptions of these two systems are as follows:

### a. Outline of the Occupational Coding System.

The Occupational Coding System used within the Agency is a modified version of the basic system utilized in all Federal agencies whereby all positions and employees are assigned an occupational code series which indicates the basic occupational group of the position and employee as well as the specific occupational specialization within the basic group. There are over 1,000 individual occupational specialization position codes arranged under 20 basic occupational groups.

One example for illustration as to how these codings are applied would be the identification of occupational specializations within the Computer Specialist Series. The basic occupational group would be the "General Administrative, Clerical and Office Services Group" coded in the GS-0300.00 through GS-0399.99 series. Within this basic group positions in the Computer Specialist Series are assigned the codes GS-0334.00 through GS-0334.99. Three selected positions in the Computer Specialist Series are:

	<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Code</u>
(1)	Computer Systems Analyst	GS-0334.01
(2)	Computer Programmer	GS-0334.02
(3)	Systems Programmer	GS-0334.06

The Computer Systems Analyst is concerned with the design of data systems for computer processing. The Computer Programmer is concerned with translation of the data systems requirements into instructions and logic to enable the computer to process the information. The Systems Programmer is concerned with the modifications and refinement of software provided by the computer manufacturer in order to meet program requirements. While each of these positions is closely related in terms of the basic occupational field, i. e., Computer Specialist, the specialized training and skill requirements of each position are sufficiently different to preclude their interchangeability.

Within other Federal agencies the qualifications requirements ascribed to each such position are rigidly honored in terms of approval of employees to encumber the position. In these circumstances, therefore, an employee assigned the occupational codes of a specific position can be assumed to possess the full credentials for and is performing the functions of the category indicated.

Under our Agency's policies and practices, however, while the positions on our Tables of Organization are established in accord with

occupational standards prescribed for each position, operating component officials make the decisions as regards employee assignments without reference to rigid qualification standards. As a result, employees frequently assume the occupational title of their position of assignment whether or not they possess the full credentials prescribed for the position or whether they in fact are performing the duties inherent in the position title.

Computer runs can be made on the number of positions and employees associated with specific occupational specialties but the actual qualifications and skills of the individuals so identified are subject to question.

b. Outline of the Qualifications Record System.

The Qualifications Record System was jointly established by the Office of Personnel and the Office of Computer Services in 1964. This system is designed to permit the identification, recording, storage and retrieval of detailed information on all Agency employees (and selected applicants) as regards their personal biographic data, foreign language ability, geographic area knowledge, military experience and training, civilian education, civilian work experience and specialization and special skills, abilities and hobbies. This highly detailed system is designed to store and produce this information in coded form by the computer permitting rapid retrieval of all or selected portions of the data when needed by Agency managers to identify employees possessing certain specialized skills, experience, education, etc., to fill specific positions requiring certain combinations of skills, knowledge and abilities.

As regards the capacity of the Qualifications Record System to identify occupational information on an individual or group of Agency employees, the present system is quite elaborate and detailed in terms of a coding structure related to all major fields of occupational activity and within these fields the refined identification of specialization within the occupational group, the capacity served

(i. e., program chief, editor, researcher, practitioner, etc.), extent of experience, source of experience, year in which experience was completed.

The Qualifications Record System is applied to all Agency employees shortly after their EOD and is updated on an annual basis through reviews of the Official Personnel Folders. In its present mode, the stored data is retrieved from the computer in coded form and requires clear text conversion by manual methods in the Control Division of the Office of Personnel.

4. The capacity of the present Qualifications Record System to identify, code, store and retrieve an almost unlimited array of data on employee specialized experiences in occupational fields would appear to offer promise, through modification, to identify occupational affinity groups within the Agency.

PASG suggests that the Office of Personnel now conduct further studies to determine the feasibility of expanding the present Qualifications Record System to serve these purposes. The need for computer reprogramming of the present system, however theoretically simple it may appear, could pose a practical problem in terms of OJCS's capability to assign resources to a project of this type. It should be recognized, therefore, that acceptance by top management of this suggestion could carry with it an obligation to make available some additional ADP resources.

**TAB**

This Notice Expires 1 February 1977

PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

25X1A

## AGENCYWIDE PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SURVEY

1. In July 1976 many employees were asked to participate in a survey dealing with Agency personnel management practices. Employee perceptions are considered important as an aid to management in determining how well personnel management programs contribute to the accomplishment of the Agency's mission. Employee responsiveness to this survey was most gratifying.

2. A 25 percent random sampling of employees was taken in this survey. In statistical practice, this number is more than sufficient to obtain a proper cross section of employee views. Participation was on an Agencywide basis and included employees assigned to the foreign and domestic field. Of the questionnaires distributed 80 percent were completed and returned. Many respondents offered helpful comments and ideas and there is confidence in the representativeness of the results of this employee survey.

3. The survey questionnaire was lengthy and broad in scope, covering 11 major areas of management interest. Some of the items used were selected from a questionnaire developed by the Civil Service Commission for the same purpose. The use of these items allowed a comparison of Agency employee responses with responses of employees from other government agencies.

4. The following statistics and statements are provided for Agency employee information only and should not be published or discussed outside of the Agency without specific prior approval from proper authority. The topic areas covered and evaluated in the questionnaire are listed with a pertinent representative sample of survey questions. (Over half the questions used in the survey are provided.) Following the listing of sample questions is a brief statement of interpretation. Research and experience indicate that unfavorable responses to a question of 25 percent or less are generally not significant. Negative responses in excess of 25 percent, however, indicate the need to give the matter close attention. The figure in the fourth column is called a percentile. It indicates how the Agency's favorable responses compared with other government agencies that responded to the same item. For example, if the percentile figure for the items reads 70 this means Agency employees were more favorable than 70 percent of other government employees who responded to the same question.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

25X1

25X1A

## PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
<b>a. MANPOWER UTILIZATION/WORK ORGANIZATION</b>					
Are you making good use of your skills and abilities on your job?	77%	7%	16%	0%	68%
Are you doing the kind of work that you like to do?	74%	9%	17%	0%	51%
Are you given enough work to do?	87%	2%	11%	0%	26%
Are you given too much work to be able to do a good job?	14%	6%	80%	0%	86%
Do you feel that in your component the job is being accomplished efficiently?	68%	11%	21%	0%	
Are people up the line interested in ideas about better ways to get the work done?	69%	16%	14%	1%	88%

The vast majority of Agency employees find their work to be interesting and challenging with management interested in bettering ways of accomplishing the work.

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
<b>b. CAREER DEVELOPMENT/CAREER COUNSELING</b>					
Do you think that, overall, your Career Service is fulfilling its responsibilities in the area of career management?	32%	26%	41%	1%	
Does your supervisor talk to you about your career development prospects?	40%	4%	53%	3%	

PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

25X1A

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
Are you encouraged to develop your skills and abilities?	67%	7%	25%	1%	76%
Are you aware that your Career Service has Developmental profiles which show the training and experience that are desirable for employees in certain occupational categories?	49%	4%	46%	1%	
Do you feel that your Career Service provides satisfactorily for employee career development needs?	29%	28%	42%	1%	
Do you feel you would jeopardize your standing in your Career Service if you responded to a vacancy notice?	25%	18%	55%	2%	
Do you believe the Agency vacancy notice system works satisfactorily?	20%	31%	48%	1%	

There is concern reflected in the negative responses among Agency employees relating to the Agency's career management program. Employees feel the Career Services could do more in this area to provide for employee career development needs.

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
c. <u>TRAINING</u>					
Are you able to get the training you need to do your job well?	72%	11%	13%	4%	79%
Have you received Agency-sponsored training since your employment here?	88%	0%	12%	0%	94%

27 December 1976

## PERSONNEL

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
If yes, has this training made you more effective on your job or better prepared for promotion?	70%	9%	12%	9%	54%
Are your training needs given adequate attention by your supervisor?	55%	16%	24%	5%	

The survey indicates the majority of employees are satisfied with the training they obtain and they feel they have adequately utilized it in better performing their jobs.

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
d. <u>PROMOTIONS/PERFORMANCE EVALUATION</u>					
Are you satisfied with your opportunities for promotion?	39%	9%	51%	1%	58%
Do you understand your Career Service (Career Sub-Group) promotion system?	62%	10%	28%	0%	
Do you think that promotions are given fairly in your Career Service (Career Sub-Group)?	34%	30%	35%	1%	59%
Are you kept pretty well informed of how you are doing on the job?	67%	7%	26%	0%	89%
Do you feel your fitness reports have been an accurate reflection of your job performance?	72%	7%	19%	2%	
Do you understand your Career Service's comparative evaluation system?	51%	10%	38%	1%	

PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

25X11A

There is a widespread lack of employee understanding of how their respective Career Service promotion and performance evaluation systems work. Many employees are not satisfied with present promotion opportunities. With respect to promotion opportunities it may be noted that when compared with other government employees Agency employees gave a typical or average response, i.e., about half the time other government employees respond more favorably to this question and half the time less favorably.

e. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (EEO)

How are employees from racial minority groups generally treated in your Career Service?

- 24% 1. Better than other employees
- 48% 2. About the same as other employees
- 3% 3. Worse than other employees
- 25% 4. Unsure

How are female employees generally treated in your Career Service?

- 11% 1. Better than male employees
- 47% 2. About the same as male employees
- 22% 3. Worse than male employees
- 20% 4. Unsure

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
Do you think the system for handling discrimination complaints is effective?	18%	68%	8%	6%	
Do you believe better job opportunities on a fair, competitive basis have been denied you because of your race?	4%	4%	72%	20%	
Do you believe better job opportunities on a fair, competitive basis have been denied you because of your sex?	11%	6%	74%	9%	
Do you feel the Agency is making progress in providing equal employment opportunities for all employees?	62%	27%	10%	1%	

## PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

It is somewhat difficult to categorize the issue of EEO. Overall results reflect a minor problem although women and racial minorities are significantly less inclined to share this view. It was generally perceived that progress in EEO is being made.

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
<b>f. COMPENSATION/RECOGNITION</b>					
Is your pay fair for the job you do?	65%	8%	27%	0%	81%
Are you given credit when you do a job well?	72%	9%	19%	0%	96%
Does management make appropriate use of Quality Step Increases as a means of recognition?	29%	25%	45%	1%	

Some Agency employees do not feel their pay is fair for the job they do; however, when compared with other government agencies, Agency employee attitudes are strongly favorable. Management from the employees' perspective could do a better job of using Quality Step Increases or other monetary awards as a means of employee recognition.

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
<b>g. SERVICES/BENEFITS/WORKING CONDITIONS</b>					
Do you understand what actions to take to protect your potential benefits should you incur an injury while on the job?	48%	9%	42%	1%	
Do the kinds of insurance programs now available to you as an Agency employee provide you with adequate coverage?	83%	8%	7%	2%	

PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

25X1A

Do you feel the Office of Personnel has done a good job in administering employee benefits?

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
Do you feel the Office of Personnel has done a good job in administering employee benefits?	52%	39%	8%	1%	

Do you feel that you are kept sufficiently up-to-date on changes affecting your benefits under these programs?

Do you feel that you are kept sufficiently up-to-date on changes affecting your benefits under these programs?	58%	17%	24%	1%
--	-----	-----	-----	----

Would you rate the following satisfactory at your job location?

Safety	89%	4%	6%	1%	69%
Work materials and equipment	87%	3%	9%	1%	89%
Lighting	82%	4%	13%	1%	46%
Cleanliness	68%	6%	25%	1%	44%
Eating facilities	55%	5%	34%	6%	61%
Transportation	65%	6%	22%	7%	54%
Parking facilities	70%	3%	23%	4%	
Temperature	60%	6%	33%	1%	
Space	68%	4%	27%	1%	

Services and benefits were favorably perceived and the Office of Personnel was considered to be administering benefits effectively. Evaluation of physical working conditions showed that while safety and work equipment were perceived as satisfactory, significant numbers were critical of cleanliness, transportation, parking facilities, space, and particularly temperature control and eating facilities.

[redacted]  
27 December 1976

PERSONNEL

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
--	-----	---	----	-------------------	------------

h. GRIEVANCES/ADVERSE ACTION

Do you know the procedures in your Career Service for handling grievances (not EEO issues)?

44%	9%	46%	1%
-----	----	-----	----

Are you satisfied with present Agency grievance procedures?

32%	52%	11%	5%
-----	-----	-----	----

Do you understand the difference between being declared "surplus" and being identified for "selection out?"

48%	7%	45%	0%
-----	----	-----	----

Do you understand how people in your Career Service are identified for selection out?

32%	6%	61%	1%
-----	----	-----	----

There is a consistent lack of understanding of procedures for handling grievances and adverse actions. Employees in many cases do not realize that being labeled surplus does not necessarily reflect on the quality of one's job performance.

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
--	-----	---	----	-------------------	------------

i. ADVANCEMENT/MOBILITY OPPORTUNITIES

Do you feel you have adequate opportunities for advancement in your Career Service?

43%	15%	41%	1%
-----	-----	-----	----

Is there adequate opportunity to transfer among the various directorates in the Agency?

20%	27%	52%	1%
-----	-----	-----	----

[redacted]

25X1

PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

25X1A

Is there adequate opportunity for rotational assignments to other positions in your Career Service?

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
--	-----	---	----	----------------	------------

38%	22%	38%	2%
-----	-----	-----	----

Do you personally feel that greater attention given to your career planning by your Career Service would be beneficial?

64%	15%	19%	2%
-----	-----	-----	----

Advancement opportunities were criticized by substantial portions of the respondents as were opportunities for rotational assignments outside of their particular components and directorates. Thirty-three percent of survey respondents claim to have actually held a different position in another directorate.

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
--	-----	---	----	----------------	------------

j. MORALE/IMPACT OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Do you feel that Agency morale has been negatively affected by external disclosures, e.g., Congressional Investigations? 59% 9% 32% 0%

Have revelations regarding the activities of the CIA had a serious negative impact on your feelings regarding employment here? 10% 4% 86% 0%

Do you think the Agency's ability to fulfill its function in the near future (1-2 years) will be seriously hampered as a result of the Congressional Investigations? 44% 18% 38% 0%

[redacted] PERSONNEL

27 December 1976

	YES	?	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	PERCENTILE
Have these external pressures (investigations, disclosures, etc.) had any significant negative influence on your ability to do your job?	11%	3%	86%	0%	

What do you feel is the overall level of morale at this time in your component?

3%	1. Very High
24%	2. High
49%	3. Moderate
17%	4. Low
5%	5. Very Low
2%	6. Unsure

The final set of questions in the survey on morale and the impact of recent investigations on the Agency pointed out that while slightly over one-fourth of the respondents felt morale was "High" to "Very High," slightly less than one-fourth felt morale was "Low" to "Very Low." Also while a majority of respondents feel Agency morale has been negatively affected by the investigations and revelations regarding Agency activities, only 10 percent felt this had a serious negative impact on their own feelings regarding employment here.

5. Several areas of employee concern were revealed in this employee survey. Although already noted, in some instances it may be worth citing those areas again. They are: (a) adequacy of programs for career development; (b) adequacy and fairness of personnel evaluation and promotion procedures; (c) need for information concerning grievance procedures and employee rights; (d) opportunity for rotation among and within directorates; and (e) confusion concerning circumstances and procedures concerning separation. The survey also revealed that a significant number of employees (41 percent of the replies) believe that the Agency has made improvements in personnel management methods and operations in the past two years.

6. Action is being taken to meet employee concerns. Coincidental to the employee survey, the Deputy Director for Central Intelligence identified similar concerns for management. Survey results were made

PERSONNEL

[redacted]  
27 December 1976

25X1

available to the Executive Advisory Group (EAG) when it met in October 1976 to discuss those personnel policies and procedures that might be reviewed to deal with these problem areas. Staff papers are presently being prepared so that EAG may consider actions to be taken. The following subjects are being addressed: (a) policy affecting the placement of individuals to key operating positions; (b) policy providing for more consistency in procedures affecting those relatively few employees separated by management initiative; (c) an assessment of employee rotation; (d) policy affecting Career Service promotion activity; and (e) policy relating to the initial placement and evaluation of new employees. In an effort to promote more satisfactory career development programs and more realistic expectations among employees, the Agency Careers Committee (a group of representatives from each of the Career Services convened to support improved career management through the exchange and dissemination of information), will review employee survey findings in this area. It is evident from the foregoing that the Agency hopes to improve its effectiveness in personnel management and that employees have reasons to be hopeful for further improvements.

FOR THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE:

JOHN F. BLAKE  
Deputy Director  
for  
Administration

DISTRIBUTION: ALL EMPLOYEES

**TAB**

UNCLASSIFIED

INTERNAL  
USE ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Agency Middle Level Manager Survey

FROM:	DATE		EXTENSION <input type="text"/>	NO. <input type="text"/>
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
F. W. M. Janney Director of Personnel SE 58 Hqs.				DATE 14 JAN 1977 STATINTL
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)				COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. Deputy Director for Administration 7D 26 Hqs.				As cited in the final section of the attached survey report, i.e., "Conclusions" the findings have significant implication as to the timing and kinds of actions top-level management should or should not consider in the months to come. Many of the Agency's mid-level managers have expressed concerns which if not adequately addressed could hurt the Agency in its efforts to become more efficient and effective in accomplishing its missions.
2.				STATINTL
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7. Director of Central Intelligence 7E 12 Hqs.				For this reason, we feel it would serve management's interests to employ the services of a specialist in organizational behavior who could most fully exploit the survey findings. It would seem appropriate to consider
8.				<input type="text"/> a recognized
9.				expert in this field and an individual experienced in providing such consultative services to several large industrial firms.
10.				It happens that <input type="text"/> currently conducts a seminar on leadership twice each year for Agency supergrade officers. We
11.				would be pleased to determine his availability should you so desire.
12.				STATINTL
13.				
14.				
15.				

F. W. M. Janney

4 JAN 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence  
VIA : Deputy Director for Administration  
FROM : F. W. M. Janney  
Director of Personnel  
SUBJECT : Agency Middle Level Manager Survey  
REFERENCE : Memo for DCI fr D/Pers dtd 21 Apr 76, subj: Morale  
of Agency Employees

1. Attached for your information is a report of the findings of a special attitudinal survey of selected Agency supervisory personnel.

2. Last spring you asked that I proceed to develop a survey directed at our mid-level Agency supervisors who, being close to the employee work situation, might throw more light on the extent public exposure, Congressional inquiry, and other recent developments have impacted on both employee morale and operating effectiveness. We formulated a questionnaire and solicited the views of staff and division chiefs in the Administration, Intelligence and Science and Technology Directorates and area branch chiefs or equivalent positions in the Operations Directorate. The questionnaire asked those incumbents in these positions for their perceptions from two separate stances: Participants were asked first to evaluate the feelings and/or the behavior of those they supervised (Section A), and, second, to evaluate their own feelings as to the impact events of the past two years have had on them in their official capacity in managing the operations of their branch or division (Section B).

3. Of the [redacted] Washington Metropolitan Area supervisors surveyed, we received [redacted] responses, i.e., a return rate of 87%. Nearly 80% of the respondents provided written comments to individual questions and some 34% offered additional comments at the end of the questionnaire citing factors they believed of special importance. We consider the response rate to be excellent and the fact that so many supervisors

[redacted] perceptions by providing written evidence in the significance of the [redacted]

25X9  
25X9

F. W. M. Janney

25X1

RESULTS OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL  
AGENCY MID-LEVEL MANAGER OPINION SURVEY  
FALL 1976

This survey was directed to a relatively small yet special segment of the Agency employee population (as defined by level and type of position), consequently all eligible employees were asked to participate. The levels and types of positions were: (1) senior management or supervisory positions at the division or staff chief level in the Intelligence, Administration and Science and Technology Directorates, and (2) senior management or supervisory positions at the branch chief level (or equivalent) in the Operations Directorate. A list of such positions was compiled by the Office of Personnel and referred to each directorate for verification. After minor changes were made to the proposed list, [redacted] questionnaires were distributed to the incumbents of these positions. A total of [redacted] returns were received and the statistics are as follows:

25X9

25X9

<u>Number Distributed</u>	<u>% of Total Distributed</u>	<u>Number Returned</u>	<u>% of Returns To Number Distributed</u>	<u>% of Returns To Total Returns</u>

--

In addition to directorate affiliation, other background data were requested from the respondent. They are shown primarily for information purposes because with minor exceptions these demographic categories do not provide particularly significant information or additional insights helpful to the interpretation of survey results.

25X9

\* This value [redacted] does not agree with the total number of returns [redacted] because some respondents did not indicate their Directorate affiliation.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number/Respondents</u>	<u>% of Total Respondents</u>
A. Length of Experience as Agency Supervisor		
Less than 2 years		4%
2 to 4 years		7%
5 to 10 years		28%
11 to 20 years		41%
More than 20 years		20%
B. Number of Employees Supervised		
1 to 15		36%
16 to 30		26%
31 to 50		17%
51 to 100		12%
101 or more		9%
*C. Tenure in Present Job		
Less than 1 year		30%
1 to 2 years		31%
2 to 3 years		15%
3 to 5 years		15%
More than 5 years		9%

\* A factor potentially significant in affecting negative employee attitudes relates to the uncertainties associated with frequent changes in organizational management. Some 76% of the respondents, representing fairly senior supervisors, have held their present positions less than 3 years while over 60% have been in their present jobs less than 2 years.

As a general rule in considering overall results, opinion sampling research suggests that negative responses of less than 20% are not to be considered very significant. Negative responses grow in significance as they approach the 40% level, and negative responses in excess of 40% are clearly noteworthy. A word of caution: with a sample of the size surveyed, minor numerical fluctuations tend to be reflected in rather major percentage changes. This is especially true when evaluating data along directorate or other demographic lines.

Each questionnaire item is shown in the same sequence as it appears on the questionnaire itself. Following each item a brief statement is made to be helpful to the evaluation of the response. Where substantial deviations by a particular group were evidenced, they are pointed out; otherwise it may be assumed that the subgroups answered at a similar level.

#### SECTION A

In this section of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to evaluate the feelings and/or the behavior of those employees under their general supervision and to disregard their own personal point of view. The participants were told to write-in a brief response, should none of the listed alternatives reasonably represent their perceptions on the matter.

##### Question 1. How do you rate morale in your unit?

1. Very High	5%
2. High	47%
3. Moderate	42%
4. Low	5%
5. Very Low	1%
6. Don't Know	0

Agency mid-level managers feel that employee morale is in the moderate-high range. This finding compares with the Agency-wide employee survey (summer 1976) where 73% described morale as being in that range. Some 11% of the DDO respondents described morale as being low.

SECRET

Question 2. Is the productivity of your unit:

1. Increasing	56%
2. Unchanging	39%
3. Decreasing	5%
4. Don't Know	0

Supervisors who served more than 20 years in that role are more convinced than those with less experience that productivity of their unit is increasing (68%). Of the Directorates, DDA expressed the strongest opinion that productivity is increasing (69%). [It should be noted that in terms of written comments, statements were made by many supervisors to the effect that increased work demands were being met without an increase in staff.]

As a result of the Select Committee's investigations beginning in January 1975, how do you perceive the following:

Question 3. How frequently as a result of these investigations have employees raised questions of propriety or legality concerning their work activities?

1. Often	9%
2. Occasionally	31%
3. Seldom	40%
4. Never	20%
5. Don't Know	0

While a majority of Agency mid-level managers believe employees seldom if ever question the legality of their work activities, the fact that some 40% of the respondents say this happens occasionally or often indicates a rather significant impact. Also important is the response from the DDO where 17% of the respondents expressed the opinion that employees often raised such questions. Of the DDI respondents, 32% said employees never raised such questions.

Question 4. To what extent have the results of these investigations caused your employees to hesitate to take action?

1. To a great extent	2%
2. To some extent	30%
3. To a small extent	35%
4. Not at all	32%
5. Don't Know	1%

Opinion expressed on the effects the investigations have had on employee willingness to take action is divided. Of the DDO respondents, 47% believed to some extent and 4% to a great extent that the investigations have caused their employees to hesitate to take action; 50% of the respondents supervising 101 or more employees rendered a similar opinion.

Question 5. How frequently as a result of the investigations have employees raised questions about the meaning and/or utility of their jobs?

1. Often	5%
2. Occasionally	21%
3. Seldom	35%
4. Never	37%
5. Don't Know	2%

More DDO mid-level supervisors are convinced that the investigations raised questions in employees' minds about the meaning and/or utility of their jobs (30% in the occasionally category, 11% in the often category). [It should be noted that in the written comments several references were made relative to the acceptability of covert action as an Agency tool.]

Question 6. Are employees more anxious about their status, i.e., fearful of their job security because of possible changes in or curtailment of Agency functions arising from Congressional Investigations?

1. Many are	7%
2. Some are	20%
3. A few are	32%
4. None are	33%
5. Don't Know	8%

Those mid-level managers supervising 51-100 or 101 or more employees express the most concern in responding to this question (15% of the former and 17% of the latter believe that many employees are anxious about their status.) Of the directorates, 32% of the DDO respondents indicated that some to many employees were more anxious than before about their status; this level was 30% in the DDS&T. Job security concerns appear to be at a reasonably significant level in the Agency.

Question 7. Do employees complain more about experiencing difficulties in doing their jobs, e.g., lack of cooperation from others, the amount of time required for handling "paper work", etc.?

1. Yes	56%
2. No	41%
3. Don't Know	3%

Agency mid-level supervisors are divided on this issue but a clear majority of the respondents feel employees have complained about experiencing difficulties in doing their jobs. In the DDO the percentage answering yes was 66%; 79% of those supervising 101 or more employees expressed the same opinion. Some 58% of the DDS&T respondents answered no to this question.

SECRET

Question 8. If yes to 7, please describe the nature of these difficulties.

The following represents a summarization and brief analysis of the written comments offered in this section. [Please note that nearly 80% of the respondents wrote comments in the questionnaire, a large number of which were directed to this question]. Responses are listed generally in their order of frequency. Employees complained to supervisors as follows:

- a. Too much paper work and too many records search requirements.
  - (1) Operational action is more limited because of paper requirements.
  - (2) Often required to participate in tasks/studies yielding no useful products.
  - (3) Additional paper work requirements are very disruptive because they are frequently levied with no notice and must be handled on a priority basis.
- b. Too many layers of coordination.
  - (1) It is harder to get approval--paper is massaged to higher echelons while operational opportunities are lost.
  - (2) Excessive regard for legality of new activities--having to clear paperwork with OGC.
  - (3) Agency is becoming too bureaucratic.

Other complaints were identified ranging from complaints about delays in the procurement of supplies and equipment to complaints that other Federal agencies are more reluctant to deal with CIA. It is interesting to note that some complaints deal with the fact that supervisors are often unavailable because of their need to respond to investigatory or Congressional inquiries. Overall, however, the issues of "paper work" and "coordination" are cited as the bases for most of the work-related difficulties for employees.

Question 9. As a result of the investigations, to what degree are employees showing more indications of disenchantment with Agency employment, i.e., less inclined to view Agency employment as a career?

1. To a much higher degree	4%
2. To a somewhat higher degree	32%
3. Unchanged	57%
4. To a lesser degree	2%
5. Don't Know	5%

While a majority of the mid-level supervisors expressed the opinion that employee attitudes about career employment with the Agency remain unchanged, the DDO supervisors represent an exception. Of DDO respondents, 9% said employees are disenchanted to a much higher degree and 46% said to a somewhat higher degree. Approximately 42% of DDS&T supervisors said employees are disenchanted to a somewhat higher degree. By contrast, 70% of the DDA felt employee attitudes remain unchanged on this matter.

Question 10. In your group to what extent do you feel the investigations have had an inhibiting effect on employees being imaginative and innovative in solving work problems or meeting work objectives?

1. They have had major inhibiting effect	5%
2. They have had some inhibiting effect	33%
3. They have no inhibiting effect	59%
4. Don't Know	3%

Although mid-level managers in general do not feel the investigations have had an inhibiting effect on employees, the fact that 38% of the respondents indicate some or major inhibiting effect reflects a fairly substantial impact on the innovativeness of Agency personnel. This is even more pronounced among the DDO supervisors: 11% said the investigations had a major inhibiting effect and 53% said they had some inhibiting effect on DDO employees.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

Question 11. How would you describe the current feelings of your employees toward Agency management?

1. Positive	36%
2. Indifferent	20%
3. Negative	16%
4. Don't Know	5%
5. Other	23%

In the opinion of mid-level managers, employees do not feel strongly positive toward Agency management. The most frequent observation that employees have positive attitudes toward Agency management comes from DDA supervisors (49%). A number of the respondents (23%) wrote other descriptors of employee attitudes toward Agency management as follows: "cynical," "uncertain," "disappointed," "irritated," etc. Those supervisors offering narrative statements said that employees (1) lack confidence in Agency management; (2) feel management is ineffective; (3) believe management lacks a sense of direction and displays little leadership; or (4) are disturbed by top management's failure to defend the CIA adequately. These comments represent observations of a decided minority of respondents but when viewed in connection with the number of supervisors who describe employee attitudes toward management as being indifferent or negative, they do suggest that Agency management has somewhat of an image problem.

Question 12. (If Applicable) What has been the impact on employees' willingness to serve overseas?

1. Many have expressed reluctance	4%
2. Some have expressed reluctance	26%
3. No real impact	53%
4. More desire to serve overseas	6%
5. Don't Know	11%

Approximately 81% of those returning questionnaires answered this question. As might be expected, a higher percentage of the DDO respondents are of the opinion that

~~SECRET~~

past events have had an impact on an employee's willingness to serve overseas. About 7% of the DDO mid-level supervisors are of the opinion that many employees expressed reluctance and 38% state that some employees have expressed reluctance to serve overseas.

Question 13. If answer to 12 is #1 or #2 please check the following reasons which in your judgment are important in the mind of the employee.

<u>9%</u>	1. Concern about excessive constraints on intelligence operations
<u>12%</u>	2. Fear of personal disclosure of Agency affiliation and possible consequences
<u>20%</u>	3. Anxiety about family's well-being while residing in an overseas environment
<u>18%</u>	4. Conclusions that incentives for overseas service are diminishing or are inadequate
<u>4%</u>	5. Other

Approximately 22% of the DDO respondents checked No. 1; 19% checked No. 2; 32% checked No. 3; and 30% checked No. 4. It appears that all are factors influencing some increased reluctance on the part of DDO employees' willingness to serve overseas. Of that small number of respondents writing additional reasons for this reluctance to serve overseas, concern was expressed about the Agency's ability to keep operations secret to protect intelligence sources. Others expressed concern related to item No. 4, i.e., the high cost of living overseas, poor or inferior medical facilities and educational opportunities, nonavailability of jobs for spouses and children, etc.

Question 14. Considering the overall impact of the investigations on how your group functions (morale, productivity, reporting relationships, paperwork, etc.) do you feel they have had:

1. A major negative impact	9%
2. A minor negative impact	58%
3. No real impact	28%
4. A minor positive impact	3%
5. A major positive impact	2%
6. Don't Know	0

~~SECRET~~  
This question asks the supervisor to make an assessment of the degree of impact the investigations have had on how his/her group functions. The results indicate that the large majority of Agency mid-level supervisors believe the impact of the investigations to be of a minor negative or negligible kind. A higher percentage of DDO supervisors (20%) conclude, however, that the recent investigations have had a major negative impact on their group.

## SECTION B

In this section of the questionnaire the participants are asked to view matters from the perspective of their roles as supervisors/managers, and express their feelings as to the impact events of the past two years have had on them in their official capacities, on the operations of their units and the accomplishments of their missions. The participants were told to write in a brief response should none of the listed alternatives reasonably represent their feelings on the matter.

Question 1. To what extent has the work load in your unit increased/decreased because of changes resulting from the recent investigations of Agency activities?

1. There has been a considerable decrease	3%
2. There has been some decrease	7%
3. There has been no change	23%
4. There has been some increase	46%
5. There has been considerable increase	21%
6. Unsure	0

A majority of Agency mid-level supervisors agree that there has been at least some increase in the work load of their units because of changes resulting from recent investigations of Agency activities. The DDI respondents have felt less of an impact, as 44% feel there has been no change in work load. DDO supervisors on the other hand feel more strongly the other way, i.e., 34% of the respondents believe there has been a considerable increase in the work load of their units.

~~SECRET~~  
Question 2. Have the investigations had any appreciable impact in making it more difficult for you to supervise effectively?

1. Yes	19%
2. No	78%
3. Unsure	3%

Although the large majority of Agency mid-level supervisors agree that the investigations have had no appreciable impact in making it more difficult for them to supervise effectively, 34% of the DDO respondents said it was more difficult.

Question 3. If yes to 2, would you attribute this difficulty as being related mostly to: (If more than one please rank in order of importance)

1. My concern for inadvertent violation of law or Agency regulation
2. Lack of clarity re my present authorities
3. Changes in internal procedures and review mechanisms
4. Changed attitudes of employees in my unit
5. Other

Reason No. 3 is cited and ranked first more than the others as being most responsible for difficulties in supervision; reason No. 1 is in second place. In this respect, of those 32 DDO supervisors answering yes to the previous question, 29 or 91% cite changes in internal procedures and review mechanisms and 22 or 69% cite concern for inadvertent violation of laws or Agency regulation as factors having a negative influence on their supervisory effectiveness. [DDO supervisors constitute the majority of those responding to the question.] Of those few persons who wrote in other reasons, some feel that the proliferation of laws and regulations as they pertain to individual rights and freedom inhibit them in carrying out their traditional supervisory role.

Question 4. Do you feel that you have to spend more time on administrative reports?

1. Yes	66%
2. No	30%
3. Unsure	4%

A clear majority of Agency mid-level supervisors feel they have to spend more time on administrative reports. Among the Directorates, DDA holds the highest percentage of yes answers, i.e. 82%. [It should be noted that the question does not suggest a specific basis for the need to spend more time on administrative reports, i.e., in the written comments there are allusions to internally generated paperwork requirements beyond those resulting from requirements levied by outside authority. Therefore, it can be concluded only that a majority of the respondents feel they spend more time on administrative reports than in the past.]

Question 5. Does the Freedom of Information Act and/or the Privacy Act pose special problems for you?

1. Yes	50%
2. No	43%
3. Unsure	6%
4. Not Applicable	1%

Although opinion is rather evenly divided on this question the fact that one-half of the Agency's mid-level supervisors feel these Acts pose special problems for them is a development of considerable significance. More DDA and DDO than other respondents indicate that these Acts do pose special problems for them.

Question 6. If yes to 5, please explain.

Of those answering yes to question No. 5, over 35% comment that the additional paperwork places a burden on the staff. Others complain that documents concerning personnel must be very carefully worded in the event such documents are later released under provisions of FOIA. They say this concern inhibits Agency officers from being totally open and candid in presenting assessments. A substantial number of respondents

express the opinion that too much time is being consumed in searching files when more important work should be done. Some supervisors complain of being burdened with trying to figure out how to comply with these Acts, with having to implement procedures in compliance, and with having to meet with other agencies on the subject. Concern that confidentiality will not be honored or protected in official dealings with others is mentioned by several respondents. The added concern for security and the need to protect intelligence sources and methods is a factor suggested by many respondents. It is apparent that for a significant number of Agency mid-level supervisors these Acts do pose an added burden; as one respondent put it ". . . procedures we have followed for many years now appear to conflict with requirements of these Acts."

Question 7. Do you anticipate any particular trouble in the future acquiring the kind of staff you need to replace losses?

1. Yes	18%
2. No	69%
3. Unsure	13%

By and large, Agency mid-level supervisors are not anticipating any particular trouble acquiring the kind of staff replacement they will need to replace future losses. The DDO and DDS&T respondents are more concerned about the matter as 28% of the former and 22% of the latter answered yes to this question.

Question 8. If yes to 7, please explain.

Several reasons are offered by those who wrote replies to this question. Two of the most common are (1) that although we may very well get the same quality of personnel who have applied in the past they more than likely will not have (or acquire) the same dedication or commitment--the Agency's prestige and mystique are gone, and (2) that because of the prospect of decreased job security, paperwork requirements, and bureaucratization of the organization, new prospects will be discouraged from joining the Agency. One DDO respondent said "younger officers don't have the same basic understanding or feel for running clandestine operations; they are too easily diverted by outside factors and they are constantly looking over their shoulders"; another respondent said that with reductions

in certain activities, it makes it difficult (if not impossible) for younger officers to gain the same level of experience as the officers they must eventually replace.

Question 9. In the foreseeable future, do you anticipate any potential threat to the continued effectiveness of your unit due to external pressures and changes within the Agency resulting from the investigations?

1. Yes	22%
2. No	58%
3. Unsure	20%

A majority of Agency mid-level supervisors do not anticipate any potential threat to the continued effectiveness of their units. Again, however, a significant number of DDO respondents disagree (42%).

Question 10. If yes to 9, please explain.

In explaining their reasons for a yes answer to the question, many respondents identified concerns such as the effect continued reorganization or the impact that continued (or threatened) budgetary and personnel reductions might have on their units' effectiveness. The prospect of continued disclosure of classified information by high level officials and ex-officials worries many respondents. There are also respondents concerned about being bogged down trying to interpret laws and regulations over what the Agency may or may not do. This would mean that few officers will be sure of themselves. Conversely, these respondents believe many officers will spend much of the time protecting themselves rather than focusing on the job to be done.

Question 11. Do you view the changing conditions in overseas environment in which the Agency must operate as influencing the effectiveness of your unit?

1. Yes	24%
2. No	52%
3. Unsure	10%
4. Not Applicable	14%

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2006/11/28 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000300060073-6

Although a slim majority of Agency mid-level supervisors are satisfied that changing conditions overseas will not influence the effectiveness of their unit, a significant number of DDO supervisors disagree (41%).

Question 12. If yes to 11, please explain.

According to several respondents giving explanations for their yes answers to question No. 11, the greater knowledge abroad (more widely diffused) of how intelligence agencies operate coupled with less opportunity for cover will make overseas operations more difficult. The terrorist threat and hostile host governments will make cover arrangements extremely expensive, say several respondents. A view expressed by some is that the continued threat of exposure of employee identities, growing cover problems, and the increased cost of living make operational work in the field less attractive. Others suggest that case officers are becoming more cautious because of changing conditions overseas. They are less aggressive, consequently less effective. Several others claim that the fear of exposure has influenced greater reluctance on the part of prospective assets to work with the U.S. Government. Some non-DDO respondents express the opinion that changing conditions overseas will mean that the information which DDO manages to obtain will in large part be less useful than information received in the past.

Question 13. (If Applicable) Have the investigations had a significant negative impact on your relationship with foreign intelligence services and other government agencies?

1. Yes	19%
2. No	38%
3. Unsure	5%
4. Not Applicable	38%

Of those 60% of the respondents for which this question was applicable, 33% answered yes; 59% answered no; and 8% answered unsure. Approximately 34% of the DDO respondents answered yes to this question.

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2006/11/28 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000300060073-6

Question 14. If yes to 13, please explain.

Clearly the strongest opinion expressed by the respondents answering yes to this question deals with the foreign intelligence services' fear that contacts, sources, and methods vital to their interests would appear in tomorrow's newspapers. As a result, liaison relationships have begun to take on a different character. The second most frequently cited class of opinion has to do with the feeling that other U.S. Government agencies are not cooperating with CIA the way they have in the past; other agencies now question the purpose of CIA requests, whereas before they were accepted without reservation; other agencies tend to view themselves as "in the drivers seat" now; CIA status as the "leader" in the Intelligence Community has diminished, and other agencies question the ability of the Agency to carry out certain major activities in the light of what has happened.

Question 15. If there are any items covered in this questionnaire on which you would like to elaborate, or if there are factors which are impacting on your unit's operations which haven't been covered, please comment here.

Some 35% of the respondents provided comments to question No. 15. Nearly half of the DDO respondents commented, while those of the other directorates did so to a much lesser extent. Rather than paraphrase or summarize these comments, selected representative excerpts from statement made by several respondents from each directorate are offered in an annex to give the reader a more satisfactory basis for drawing conclusions.

CONCLUSIONS

It is evident that public disclosure, Congressional inquiry, and other recent developments have had an impact on the Agency. In the case of the DDO, this impact can be described as major.

Over one quarter of Agency mid-level supervisors report that employees have raised questions about the meaning of their jobs. Add this to the fact that a similar number of managers indicate employees are more anxious about their job security, and the result is a cause for some concern. A number of supervisors are wary of continued Agency reorganization as the new administration takes charge. Employees who

SECRET

question the significance of their jobs or who fear losing their jobs operate at less than maximum effectiveness. The Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts have proven to be burdensome to a large number of mid-level managers. Also in their judgments, preoccupation with questions of legality have tended to hamper the innovativeness of employees or cause them to hesitate unduly in taking action toward satisfying work requirements. A serious question exists in the minds of some survey respondents as to the Agency's willingness to fully support its officers on legal challenges to actions which these officers had reason to believe were proper under the Agency's mandate. In this respect managers are asking that they be given clear legal guidelines for making decisions on actions contemplated. The survey results suggest that the Agency, to a significant extent, is still feeling the effects of events of the recent past. Based on the opinions of many of its mid-level managers, these effects, unless alleviated, will continue to have a detrimental impact on the Agency's ability to accomplish its mission.

~~SECRET~~

ANNEX

Approved For Release 2006/11/28 : CIA-RDP82-00367R000300060073-6

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPTS FROM RESPONDENT WRITTEN REMARKS  
AGENCY MID-LEVEL MANAGER SURVEY  
FALL 1976

DDA

"I think the impact of the Investigative Committees, while somewhat difficult and time consuming during the investigations, has had no real lasting effect upon this organization. There has been a tendency toward over reacting."

\*\*\*\*\*

"I do not feel that the investigations per se should continue to be singled out as the only cause of our current problems. I suspect that the many senior personnel changes over the last few years have had an equal impact. Gone are the known and positive attitudes, goals and directives. The expression 'which way now' is raised much too frequently. The tragedy is the response. 'Hope for the best but CYA.' Now what kind of morale can you have or expect in such a situation?"

\*\*\*\*\*

"I do feel, however, that in the past six or eight months the morale or level of irritation in the Agency is at a lower ebb than at any time previous. Much of it originates, I believe, in internal matters, rather than external. The continuing inequities of office space, office equipment and conditions, office locations, moves seen by most as serving one powerful interest against a less powerful one, the varying conditions and services at the different locations, are all building into a general unhappiness with management."

"The current management style of the Agency is a factor in employee morale. The sense of hurried confusion (and that is the only term I can think of to describe it), lack of explanation or reason, the withdrawal of responsibility and authority to ever higher echelons, (with the work continuing to be done at the lower levels) the short deadlines for material of importance requiring careful thought and development, the priorities overtaking priorities, the sense of crisis management . . . all have contributed to an erosion of morale."

\*\*\*\*\*

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2006/11/28 : CIA-RDP82-00367R000300060073-6

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2006/11/28 : CIA RDP82-00357R000300060073-6

"I believe that the greatest concern of most employees is the fact that it is now apparent that we are no longer able to assure the security of our operations, and that under such circumstances the probability of success is greatly diminished. The employee's feeling is usually one of frustration because of the contradiction between the requirement for secrecy if the mission is to be achieved, and the certainty that the very broad coordination and control mechanisms will make it difficult or impossible to meet the requirement."

\*\*\*\*\*

DDI

"Each new Director has brought with him a radically different view of what we should do and how we should do it. We're beginning to wonder what the Carter administration has in store."

"In view of all the shuffling, the Agency's top management might best proceed with some humility. Perhaps our current structure isn't perfect--but is it really worse than new chaos every year? Let's settle on some plan--any plan--and then stick to it for at least two years. Let's get back to work."

\*\*\*\*\*

"Many on my staff and whom I counsel indicate their belief that the Agency's credibility has been severely damaged. This puts the professional in an ambiguous position--offering a service to which no one of importance may subscribe. As a consequence, I see employees pulling in, often doing the minimum to get by, risking emotional commitment to the Agency and the work only rarely and in unguarded moments. This must impair our effectiveness. It certainly raises the level of petty protectiveness within the institution. No one wants to take a chance and risk losing. No one is sure of the rules. The feeling that we are strong and do many useful (legal) things has been dissipated by uncertainty about the Agency's position."

\*\*\*\*\*

"The current reorganization of the DDI, however, is probably doing more to sap internal morale and spirit of this unit than has Congress."

"What we have tried to construct over the years is being dismantled as though we were being punished for massive failure."

\*\*\*\*\*

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2006/11/28 : CIA RDP82-00357R000300060073-6

~~SECRET~~DDO

"It is not what the Agency has been accused of nor the demoralizing publicity, nor the negative attitudes and power of the press and important elements of Congress, that may have weakened employee morale and dedication. Those aspects of the 'investigations' may have even strengthened employees' loyalty and self-assurance but the almost complete lack of support from the White House, other executive agencies, and respected (and supposedly supportive) members of Congress leave employees (myself included) with the impression that those for whom we have been working all these years have precious little appreciation of it all."

Where were our employers when we needed them? Where were our leaders who ordered us to do these things when the time came to take the responsibility publicly? Granted, we've a silent service, which is supposed to permit our public leaders the opportunity to deny knowledge and disavow responsibility. But that is on a routine basis. When it came to the crunch, and the Agency's reputation and even purpose came into question, that is when we were abandoned. Is there an Agency employee who doesn't feel that to some degree?"

\*\*\*\*\*

"I believe many of us are waiting to see if the new administration and the Congress want to have an effective Secret Intelligence Service."

\*\*\*\*\*

"The impact of the investigations has not affected my units' operations nearly as much as the overwhelming demands of various bureaucratic mechanisms, i.e., MBO (the DDO version), FOIA, PIA, the increasingly ponderous and demanding personnel system etc. etc. How did we ever function effectively for so many years without Letters of Instruction, for example--perhaps the ultimate example of bureaucratic overkill. The endless paperwork is seriously affecting both morale and our ability to accomplish our mission."

\*\*\*\*\*

"I fear that the selective unmasking of DDO operational activity for the singular purpose of publicizing what is considered wrong in the past, particularly when judged in light of present day world conditions, has projected a gruesomely distorted image of the Directorate.

~~SECRET~~

This has left employees with a sense of frustration, confusion and bewilderment, and a feeling that the press, the lawmakers and the public would be hard pressed to find enough positive things in the past 28 years to justify the DDO's existence."

\*\*\*\*\*

"My unit consists of middle level, younger personnel, who have few realistic options to CIA employment. They, including myself, have too many years invested to think of leaving. Therefore, they are conditioned by the reality to stick it out and weather the storm. They look to the future with guarded optimism based upon a belief that CIA is needed and its worth will eventually be evident to the doubters. Thus, the mission will prevail and there will be room for dedicated and loyal employees."

\*\*\*\*\*

"In my judgment, action to indict CIA officers for actions taken with full expectation they were legal could, if undertaken, greatly modify the findings of this study. Failure of top leadership to protect such individuals is already seriously affecting perceptions of CIA as worthy of the continuing loyalty of its staff. The issue is still open, however, and a favorable outcome would have useful impact on employee attitudes."

\*\*\*\*\*

DDS&T

"It appears to me that one result not covered in the questionnaire is a certain reduction in aggressiveness. Thus the Agency was unable to effectively fight for control of some projects or to defend budget requests in other areas. As a result, our participation in or control over some areas has been very significantly reduced. In point of fact, those agencies now in the dominant role are less capable to exercise control than are Agency officers, but I expect the situation is irreversible."

\*\*\*\*\*

**SECRET**

"Justifying our actions to the Nth degree is bound to compromise our efficiency. Oversight needs to be held to a reasonable level and lines of communication to those exercising the oversight responsibility need to be established which don't tie up the Agency's top management to the point they are unavailable for other management functions."

\*\*\*\*\*

"My own question is more general--will the Agency managers become so cautious and bureaucratic that they choose the path of least risk in all cases, thereby minimizing mistakes but eliminating the quick-reaction effectiveness for which the Agency has been known?"

\*\*\*\*\*

"CIA management at the highest levels must establish some clear guidelines for managers to follow, permitting them to make those decisions and take those actions which are unambiguously within the scope of their charters. I believe this is extremely important, and must be initiated soon if the Agency is to pass through this transition period without serious degradation of its effectiveness and its future."

**SECRET**